arXiv:0809.3081v1 [quant-ph] 18 Sep 2008

Some quantum error correction codewords are undetermined by their parts

Wen-Tai Yen,[1] Li-Yi Hsu[1], and Min-Hsiu Hsieh,[2]

[1] *Department of physics, Chung Yuan Christian University, Chungli, Taiwan and*

[2] *Ming Hsieh Electrical Engineering Department,*

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089

(Date textdate; Received textdate; Revised textdate; Accepted textdate; Published textdate)

Abstract

We investigate the two-level, multi-partite quantum states with their non-injective reduced density matrices. As pointed out by Walck and Lyon, the undetermined states are stabilizer states [5]. From this viewpoint, we firstly discuss the connections between the codewords of stabilizer quantum error correction codes and the undetermined states. Using these connections, some novel sets of undetermined states are found. Then we discuss the usefulness of undeterminedness property on quantum cryptography. In particular, we modify the quantum secret sharing scheme proposed by Hillery *et. al.* [7]. The security is proved using the undeterminedness of the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states. Finally, the undetermined mixed states are also studied.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud , 03.67.Pp, 03.67.Dd,

Keywords: Entanglement, stabilizer states, quantum cryptography

Quantum entanglement has been regarded as an useful physical resource in quantum information and quantum computation. Wherein, different non-local correlations embedded in entanglement are employed for different tasks. It is very important to quantify and characterize quantum entanglement in quantum information science. In the last decade, a lot of measures in various aspects of research purposes have been proposed [1]. An interesting approach is to measure information contained in the reduced density matrix of a given state. More specifically, for an arbitrary two-level multi-party entangled state, it is concerned whether the partial or low-ordered correlations of the reduced matrices can fully reveal the high-ordered correlations. If the answer is positive, these entangled states, either pure or mixed, can be completely determined by their parts. Surprisingly, as originally indicated by Linden *et. al.*, *almost* every pure three-qubit entangled state can be entirely determined by its two-qubit reduced density matrices [2]. Diósi illustrated the explicit solution of constructing the three-party pure state using any two two-qubit reduced density matrices [4]. Furthermore, Linden and Wootters showed that a fraction of quantum particles of almost n-party multi-level pure entangled states can reveal as much information as that of all particles [3]. However, the question of precisely characterizing which states are determined by their reduced density matrices remained open.

On the other hand, we are interested in characterizing which states are *undetermined* by their reduced density matrices. We will show that these undetermined states are proven to be extremely useful in quantum cryptography. Recently, Walck and Lyons showed that the generalized n-qubit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states and their local unitary equivalents are the only states that are not uniquely determined among pure states by their reduced density matrices of $n-1$ qubits [5]. In this letter, we generalize the work of [5], and construct more undetermined states using the stabilizer quantum error-correcting codes (SQECCs). Furthermore, we demonstrate several applications of these undetermined states in quantum cryptography.

We say that two n-qubit pure states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are D-undetermined, or unconditionally D-undetermined, if their reduced density matrices of the remaining $(n-D)$-qubit of $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are always the same after tracing out any arbitrary D qubits. We can modify the claim in [5] as follows.

Claim: If $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are D-undetermined, then for arbitrary D-qubit set $(i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_D)$, there is a unitary $U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$ such that $|\psi_1\rangle = U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}|\psi_0\rangle$.

proof: Let $s_D = \{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D\}$, and let ρ_{s_D} denote the D-qubit reduced density matrix of $|\psi_0\rangle$. Using the spectral decomposition, we can write ρ_{s_D} as

$$\rho_{s_D} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{2^D-1} p_{s_D}^{\ell} |\ell\rangle\langle\ell|,$$

for some orthonormal basis $|\ell\rangle$, where $\{p_{s_D}^{\ell}\}$ are eigenvalues of ρ_{s_D}.

From the Schmit decomposition, we can write

$$|\psi_0\rangle = \sum_{\ell=0}^{2^D-1} \sqrt{p_{s_D}^{\ell}} |\ell\rangle \otimes |\tilde{\ell}\rangle,$$

where $\{|\tilde{\ell}\rangle\}$ are $(n-D)$-qubit eigenvectors, and constitute a 2^D-dimensional subspace of the 2^{n-D}-dimensional Hilbert space. Furthermore, the remaining $(n-D)$-qubit reduced density matrix $\rho_{\bar{s}_D}$ of $|\psi_0\rangle$ is

$$\rho_{\bar{s}_D} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{2^D-1} p_{s_D}^{\ell} |\tilde{\ell}\rangle\langle\tilde{\ell}|.$$

Since the reduced density matrix of $|\psi_1\rangle$ when tracing out $i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_D$ qubits is the same as $\rho_{\bar{s}_D}$, we can express $|\psi_1\rangle$ as

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \sum_{\ell=0}^{2^D-1} \sqrt{p_{s_D}^{\ell}} |\hat{\ell}\rangle \otimes |\tilde{\ell}\rangle,$$

where $\{|\hat{\ell}\rangle\}$ are the orthonormal basis of the 2^D-dimensional Hilbert space.

We can now relate the two set of orthonormal basis $\{|\ell\rangle\}$ and $\{|\hat{\ell}\rangle\}$ by a unitary $U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$, such that

$$|\hat{\ell}\rangle = U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}|\ell\rangle,$$

for all ℓ. Notice that $U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$ cannot be decomposed as tensor products comprising any single-qubit identity operator. It follows directly that

$$|\psi_1\rangle = U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}|\psi_0\rangle.$$

This concludes the proof.

Notice that if we have repeated eigenvalues, the above proof also holds. However, in this case, we have freedom of choosing different unitary matrices.

In addition, for two arbitrary D-qubit sets $(i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_D)$ and $(i'_1, i'_2, \cdots, i'_D)$, there must exist some D-qubit unitary matrices $U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$ and $U_{i'_1 i'_2 \cdots i'_D}$, such that $|\psi_1\rangle = U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle = U_{i'_1 i'_2 \cdots i'_D}|\psi_0\rangle$. As a result,

$$U^{-1}_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D} U_{i'_1 i'_2 \cdots i'_D} |\psi_0\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle .$$

That is, $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ both are *stabilizer states.* An interesting perspective is to regard $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ as logic states, or codewords, of an $[[n, 1, d]]$ stabilizer quantum error-correcting code. In this way, $U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$ and $U_{i'_1 i'_2 \cdots i'_D}$ each correspond to the logic bit-flip operators.

To be more specific, for the logic states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ of an $[[n, 1, d]]$ stabilizer code, the corresponding density matrices are

$$\rho_i = |\psi_i\rangle \langle\psi_i| = \frac{1}{2}(I + (-1)^i \overline{Z}) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \otimes \frac{1}{2}(I + g_i),\ i \in \{0, 1\}. \tag{1}$$

Wherein, $\overline{Z}$ is logic σ_z operator, and g_1, g_2, $\cdots$, g_{n-1} are generators of the stabilizer group $\mathcal{S}$ with its normalizer denoted by $\mathcal{N}$. Note that there is some degree of freedom for choosing logic σ_x operator, denoted by $\overline{X}$. Let the operator X satisfy the condition

$$X \in \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{S} \text{ and } \{X,\, \overline{Z}\} = 0.$$

We can also choose any of $X\mathcal{S}$ or X as $\overline{X}$. Here we define the set of all legitimate $\overline{X}$ operators as $\mathcal{X}$, where

$$\mathcal{X} = \{X | X \in \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{S} \text{ and } \{X, \overline{Z}\} = 0\}.$$

By definition, given an $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC, there must exist *at least* one d-qubit *undetected* error $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_d} = (\mathcal{E}_{i_1} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{E}_{i_d})$, where $\mathcal{E}_i$ is a non-identity Pauli operator on qubit i, such that $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_d} |\psi_0\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle$. Obviously, $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_d} \in \mathcal{X}$. However, in order for $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ to be D-undetermined states, the following stronger condition is required: for *arbitrary* D qubits $i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_D$, there must be at least an *undetected* error operator $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D} \in \mathcal{X}$. It follows that the parameters D and d are not necessarily equal, and D is at least as large as d $(D \geq d)$.

It is not trivial that given an $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC, there always exists some $D \geq d$ such that its codewords are D-undetermined states. However, we can provide simple necessary condition as follows. Let E_D be the number of operators in $\mathcal{X}$ whose weight is D. The condition, $E_D \geq C^n_D = \frac{n!}{D!(n-D)!}$, is a necessary condition for an $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC such that its codewords are D-undetermined states.

Notice that, the unitary $U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$ used to define D-undetermined states is, in general, an arbitrary D-qubit unitary matrix in $\mathrm{SU}(2)^D$. It is very difficult to construct the undetermined states based on this definition. However, as long as for each unitary $U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$, there exists an error operator $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$ that lies in the support of $U_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$ and belongs to the set of legitimate logic σ_x operators, $\mathcal{X}$, we can always map the undetermined states into the codewords of some $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC.

Before introducing new sets of undetermined states, we first show how to recover the result of [5] using the idea of SQECCs. Let $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ be $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} + |1\rangle^{\otimes n})$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} - |1\rangle^{\otimes n})$, respectively. Let $g_i = Z_i Z_{i+1}$, $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n-1\}$ and $\overline{Z}$ can be set as $X^{\otimes n}$. It is noteworthy that such an $[[n, 1, 1]]$ stabilizer code can correct all the single bit-flip errors, but not single qubit phase-flip errors. Obviously, $Z_i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\{Z_i, \overline{Z}\} = 0$. In other words, $Z_i \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall i$. Therefore, these two states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are 1-undetermined states. Furthermore, any pure state spanned by $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ is also 1-undetermined state. In other words, the code space of the $[[n, 1, 1]]$ SQECC contains the set of 1-undetermined states.

This example demonstrates the power of the stabilizer formalism. We can see that the undetermined states are the stabilizer states of some $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECCs; however, the distance d is not important here. What we care about is the set of logic σ_X operators of the SQECC.

Now we introduce some novel sets of the undetermined states. Firstly, we consider the $[[4, 1, 2]]$ stabilizer quantum error correction code with the following generators $g_1 = Y_1 Y_3$, $g_2 = Y_2 Y_4$, and $g_3 = Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4$. If we pick $\overline{Z} = Y_1 X_2 Z_4$, then it is easy to verify that

$$\{Y_1 Y_2,\ Y_2 Y_3,\ Y_3 Y_4,\ Y_4 Y_1,\ Z_1 Z_3,\ X_2 X_4\} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

As a result, the two-qubit reduced density of the logic states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are always the same.

Another set comprises the logic states of the $[[5, 1, 3]]$ SQECC [9], where the corresponding g_i and $\overline{Z}$ are $\mathfrak{R}^{i-1}(X_1 Z_2 Z_3 X_4 I_5)$ and $Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4 Z_5$, respectively ($\mathfrak{R}$ is the right-shift operator). Interestingly, we have

$$\{Y_2 Y_3 X_5 + \text{ cyclic terms},\ X_1 Z_2 Z_5 + \text{ cyclic terms }\} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Therefore, they are 3-undetermined states, and undetermined by their 2-qubit reduced density matrices. Inspired by the $[[5, 1, 3]]$ code, we consider the following n-qubit cyclic stabilizer states. Wherein, the corresponding density matrices ρ_i are defined as Eq. (1) with the

g_i and $\overline{Z}$ are $\mathfrak{R}^{i-1}(X^{\otimes p}Z^{\otimes 2p}X^{\otimes p}I^{\otimes q})$ and $Z^{\otimes 4p+q}$, respectively. Note that $n = 4p + q$ and $q \equiv n \bmod 4$. By brute-force search, for $7 \leq n \leq 15$, we find that when arbitrary $n-2$ qubits are traced out, the reduced density matrices are undetermined.

We can weaken the unconditionally undetermined condition as follows. Two states are called conditionally D'-undetermined states, if when some particular set of D' qubits are traced out, the reduced density matrices are undetermined. This particular set corresponds to the *unauthorized set* first mentioned in [11]. Obviously, the minimal D' is d if these two conditionally undetermined states are logic states of some SQECCs. Actually, it is obvious that $d \leq D' \leq D$. As a concrete example, we consider the $[[7, 1, 3]]$ Steane code [10], where the six stabilizers are $X_3X_4X_5X_6$, $X_2X_3X_6X_7$, $X_1X_3X_5X_7$, $Z_3Z_4Z_5Z_6$, $Z_2Z_3Z_6Z_7$, $Z_1Z_3Z_5Z_7$, and $\overline{Z} = Z_1Z_2Z_3Z_4Z_5Z_6Z_7$. It is easy to see that $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are conditionally 3-undetermined states since $\mathrm{Tr}_{(234)}(|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|) \neq \mathrm{Tr}_{(234)}(|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1|)$. By further check, these two logic states become unconditionally 5-undetermined if arbitrary five qubits are traced out.

Applications: In the following, we will show that the undetermined states have several important applications in quantum cryptography. First, the undetermined states can be used to prove the impossibility of the unconditional security of quantum bit commitment [6]. In brief, the dishonest sender initially prepares the singlet state, $|B\rangle_{12} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle_{12} - |10\rangle_{12})$. In the sealing phase, s/he keeps the qubit 1 and seals the qubit 2 into the black box, which is delivered to the honest receiver. Notably, the states $|B\rangle_{12}$ and $(U \otimes I)\,|B\rangle_{12}$ are undetermined by their single-qubit density matrices, where U and I are the single qubit operation and 2×2 identity matrix, respectively. That is, the honest receiver is never aware of any single qubit operation on qubit 1. Nevertheless, the dishonest sender can perform the single qubit operation U on the qubit 1 to access the full information via the anti-perfect correlation of the singlet state.

Second, the quantum secret sharing (QSS) scheme proposed by Hillery *et. al.* [7] is proven insecure by Qin *et. al.* very recently [8]. Here we demonstrate that the undetermined states can save the security of the QSS scheme. Here we brief the original QSS scheme as follows. In the distribution phase, the sender Alice *always* initially prepares the same three-qubit GHZ states, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 3} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 3})$ in each round. Then she sends two of these three qubits to each the receivers, Bob and Charlie. Afterwards, all three parties perform either σ_y or σ_x measurement at random. The receivers each send the measurement basis to Alice. On the other hand, Alice performs her measurement. Here the secret bit is Alice's measurement outcome. In the revealing phase, Alice announces her measurement basis. If either one or three σ_x measurements are preformed among these three parties, they keep their respective outcomes, otherwise these outcomes are discarded. As for the reserved outcomes, Bob and Charlie have to collaborate to deduce Alice' outcome. To achieve this, they just reveal their respective outcomes to each other in private. At last, in order to detect the eavesdropping in the checking phase, some portion of the outcomes should be chosen randomly and then announced public. If the bit error rate is beyond some threshold, there must exist eavesdropping and hence the secret bits should be abandoned.

To access the secret without other's assistance, the dishonest receiver, say Charlie, intercepts the delivered qubits and perform joint operations on the these two qubits with one ancilla qubit. He then resends one of the intercepted qubit to Bob. In the revealing phase, the dishonest Charlie can forge his measurement basis before the actual measurement. In addition, he wiretaps Bob's measurement basis. Finally, after Alice's announcement, Charlie himself can deduce Alice's outcome by performing the joint measurement on qubits at hand without Bob's assistance [8].

The essential weakness of the original protocol lies in the changeless state prepared in the distribution phase. To rescue its security, the QSS protocol can be modified as follows. In the preparation phase of each round, one of the logic states of $[[3,1,1]]$ stabilizer code, which are $|\psi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 3} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 3})$ and $|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 3} - |1\rangle^{\otimes 3})$, are initially prepared with equal probability. Then two qubits of the prepared three-qubit state are sent to the receivers. In the revealing phase, Alice announces which state is prepared after she ensures that Bob and Charlie have exchanged their measurement outcomes. The proof of security is analogue to the impossibility of the secure quantum bit commitment as addressed above [6]. Essentially, the two-qubit density matrices of the states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are always the same. Since these two GHZ states with the same two-qubit density matrices are randomly distributed, the undetermined states can prevent an eavesdropper from gaining any information. Therefore, even with ancilla qubits, it is impossible for the dishonest Charlie to perform any operation on intercepted qubits to discriminate between the states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$. In this condition, any forge can be regarded as random guess, which can be detected at the checking phase with half probability. Therefore, the modified quantum secret sharing scheme is unconditionally secure.

Furthermore, the modified QSS scheme can generalized as follows. Let the honest sender distributes at most $n - D$ qubits of any of the n-qubit D-undetermined entangled states to m receivers. As a result, even intercepting all delivered qubits, any dishonest receiver cannot determine which states are distributed. Using the protocol similar to the above modified protocol, the correlation embedded in quantum entanglement can exploited for secret sharing.

Third, the D-undetermined states provide unconditional security for a quantum $((n - D+1, n))$ threshold scheme if such scheme exists [11]. A quantum $((k, n))$ threshold scheme has n shares, of which *any* k shares are sufficient to reconstruct the secret, while any set of $k - 1$ or fewer shares has no information about the secret. This can be easily verified because that the reduced density matrix of any set of parties less than or equal to D is the same. Furthermore, the conditionally D'-undetermined states from some SQECC provide us a trivial way of determining the unauthorized sets (therefore its quantum access structure [11]) when we use the codewords of this SQECC in the quantum secret sharing protocol.

Discussion: Now we demonstrate how to construct undetermined mixed states. The simplest way is to consider n-qubit D-undetermined pure states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ with D larger than 1. For some $D' < D$, we consider the two mixed states ρ'_0 and ρ'_1, where $\rho'_0 = r_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{D'}}(|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|)$ and $\rho'_1 = tr_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{D'}}(|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1|)$. As a result, it is easy to verify that ρ'_0 and ρ'_1 are D''-undetermined with $D'' = D - D'$.

On the other hand, we conjecture the existence of the undetermined mixed states from another different approach. Here we consider the $[[n,\ 2,\ d]]$ codes with the logic states $|\overline{ij}\rangle$, $i\ ,j \in \{0,\ 1\}$. The corresponding density matrices are

$$|\overline{ij}\rangle\langle\overline{ij}| = \frac{1}{2}(I + (-1)^i \overline{Z}_i)\frac{1}{2}(I + (-1)^j \overline{Z}_j)\prod_{\ell=1}^{n-2} \otimes \frac{1}{2}(I + g_\ell),$$

where $\overline{Z}_1$ and $\overline{Z}_2$ each are logic σ_z operators. In addition, denote the set $\mathcal{X}_i = \{X_i|\ X_i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\{X_i,\ \overline{Z}_i\} = 0\}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and $\mathcal{N}$ the normalizer of the stabilizer group generated by $g_1,\ g_2, \cdots,\ g_{n-2}$. Now, define the density matrices of two mixed states

$$\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2}(|\overline{00}\rangle\langle\overline{00}| + |\overline{11}\rangle\langle\overline{11}|),$$

and

$$\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}(|\overline{10}\rangle\langle\overline{10}| + |\overline{01}\rangle\langle\overline{01}|).$$

If the mixed states ρ_0 and ρ_1 are D-undetermined, by definition, for arbitrary D qubits i_1,

$i_2, \cdots, i_D$, there must be an undetected error $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D}$, such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_D} \in \mathcal{X}_{12} = \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2 - \mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{X}_2.$$

As a trivial example, we consider the [[4, 2, 2]] code. Wherein, $g_1 = Y_1Y_2Y_3Y_4$, $g_2 = Z_1Z_2Z_3Z_4$, $Z_1 = Z_2Z_3$ and $Z_2 = Z_1Z_2$. It is easy to find that

$$Z_1X_2Y_3,\ Z_2X_3Y_4,\ X_1Z_3Y_4,\ X_1Z_2Y_4 \in \mathcal{X}_{12}.$$

Notably, here $2 = d \neq D = 3$.

In conclusion, we investigate the two-level undetermined, either pure or mixed, states. Wherein, the connections with the codewords of the stabilizer quantum error correction codes are explored. Via these connections, some new sets of undetermined states are discovered. The potential applications of undetermineness are also discussed. Nevertheless, the generalized multi-level undetermined states are still open questions for further studies.

The author LYH would like to thank Prof. Feng-Li Lin for stimulating discussion. He also acknowledges support from National Science Council of the Republic of China under Contract No. NSC.96-2112-M-033-007-MY3. The author MHH receives support from NSF Grant No. ECS-0507270.

[1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, e-print arXiv: quant-ph/0702225.

[2] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 207901 (2002).

[3] N. Linden and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 277906 (2002).

[4] L. Diósi, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 010302 (2004).

[5] S. N. Walck and D. W. Lyons, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050501 (2008).

[6] H.-K. Lo and H. F. Chau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3410 (1997).

[7] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1829 (1999).

[8] S.-J. Qin, F. Gao, Q.-Y. Wen, and F.-C. Zhu, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 062324 (2007).

[9] R. Laflamme, C. Miquel, J. P. Paz, and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 198 (1996).

[10] A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996).

[11] D. Gottesman, Phys. Rev. A. **61**, 042311 (2000).